## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff, : Case No. 1:25-cr-13

v. Judge Jeffery P. Hopkins

SERGIO ANDRES ORTEGA CABELLO (1), BASTIAN ALEJANDRO ORELLANA MORALES (2), and JORDAN FRANCISO QUIROGA SANCHEZ (3).

Defendants.

## ORDER

This matter came before the Court for a preliminary pretrial conference on March 4, 2025, at 4:00 p.m. Counsel for the Government and counsel for the Defendants were present. Counsel for the Government advised the Court that discovery is in process and additional time is needed to complete production. Counsel for the Defendants requested a 60-day continuance in order to complete discovery, review the materials produced, and discuss matters with the Government. The parties agreed to a telephonic status conference on **April** 30, 2025, at 3:00 p.m. There were no objections to the speedy trial clock being tolled through the date of that status conference.

The Court is satisfied that counsel are exercising due diligence in this matter, but the parties must be permitted additional time to review discovery and either engage in plea negotiations or prepare for trial. The Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the Defendants in a speedy trial,

as failure to grant the continuance would deprive the parties of reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, and thus would likely lead to a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(i), (B)(iv).

Based on the foregoing, the Court **GRANTS** the continuance and also finds the period of time elapsing from **March 4, 2025 until April 30, 2025** is properly, and shall be, excluded from the speedy trial calculation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 4, 2025

Jeffery P. Hopkins
United States District Judge

P. Lopkins